



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Language education policy in multilingual Scotland

Citation for published version:

Hancock, A 2014, 'Language education policy in multilingual Scotland: opportunities, imbalances and debates', *Language Problems and Language Planning*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 167 –191.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.38.2.04han>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1075/lplp.38.2.04han](https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.38.2.04han)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Language Problems and Language Planning

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Language education policy in multilingual Scotland : opportunities, imbalances and debates. / Hancock, Andrew.
In: Language Problems and Language Planning, Vol. 38, No. 2, 2014.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Language Education Policy in Multilingual Scotland

Opportunities, imbalances and debates

Andy Hancock

University of Edinburgh.

Scotland is a small country yet it has a rich and complex linguistic makeup. The aim of this article is to analyse the current picture of the role of language education policy (LEP) in supporting and developing Scotland's diverse languages drawing on policy documents, policy discourses and school pedagogies. The article begins with a historical account of multilingual Scotland in order to contextualize LEP and to dispel the myth of a monolingual country. This is followed by an examination of the three main language perspectives currently influencing LEP: regional languages, modern foreign languages and the languages of migrant communities. It will be illustrated that a post-devolutionary arena has provided opportunities for formulating and debating LEP which reflect a multilingual society, but significant imbalances and questions of equity still remain between the different categories of languages in terms of ideology, provision and practice. Finally, Lo Bianco's (2007) taxonomy of language planning and action is modified to gain insights into the tensions and challenges that exist around a cohesive approach to LEP development in Scotland.

Key words: language education policy, Scotland regional languages, heritage languages, Scots Gaelic, complementary schools

Of all the language policy domains the educational context is one of the most powerful and far-reaching forces of language control as formal education provides a conduit for the conversion of political and societal ideologies into practice (Spolsky, 2009). Language education policy (LEP) can be manifested through the choice of the official language(s) of instruction; the choice of additional foreign languages to study and the confirmation or negation of linguistic minority heritage languages.¹ Consequently, schools become significant spaces for the imposition of, and resistance to, language manipulation in a system that is mandatory for all children and young people to participate in (Shohamy, 2006, p. 77). This article will therefore focus on the impact of LEP on school-aged children and young people in Scotland today. That is the decisions about which languages should be used or taught and how languages are acquired in schools as a result of historical legacies and contemporary socio-cultural and political factors.

Scotland is an interesting site for the study of LEP as parliamentary devolution in 1999² has produced a renewed sense of national identity and a re-examination of language affiliations in society (Nicolson, 2003). It is also claimed that constitutional change has led to greater autonomy in policy formation and has created more opportunities for civic engagement in forums in which educational policy is discussed. This broadening of the consultative process is evident in the national debate on education (Munn, Stead, McLeod, Brown, Cowie, McCluskey, Pirrie & Scott, 2004). Moreover, a number and range of LEP reports have been formulated and LEP research projects commissioned by the Scottish Parliament over the last decade. Yet, unlike other predominantly English speaking countries, such as Australia which have developed comprehensive language policies, such an inclusive and coordinated policy remains elusive in Scotland. In its place LEP developments have occurred in an eclectic fashion as various language groups compete against a predominantly English monolingual school system.

Using Fishman's (1999) categories of language types and more recently Thürmann,

Vollmer and Pieper's (2010) language-in-education definitions the languages considered for policy treatment since devolution in Scotland include: regional languages (Gaelic and Scots); modern foreign languages (MFL), consisting mainly of official languages of the European Union (such as French, German and Spanish), and the languages of migrants (including the acquisition of English). This article deals with each of these language domains in turn alongside an analysis of how the different language fields are represented in policy documents and policy discourses and what provision is offered in schools for learning these languages. The final section draws on Lo Bianco's (2007) taxonomy of spheres of language planning and action and discusses some of the political and ideological forces at play that influence LEP formation in order to explain the imbalances and tensions that exist around LEP development in Scotland. First of all, the article begins by situating LEP within a historical context of multilingual Scotland in order to counter the myth of a monolingual country.

Multilingual heritage

Scotland may be a small nation of just over five million inhabitants but historical sources indicate that certain languages have held a particular status within education and government alongside a range of additional languages spoken by large sections of the community (Murdoch, 1996). For instance, Gaelic is the longest-established of Scotland's languages for which records exist, having arrived in the west of Scotland as a result of incursions of settlers from Ireland in the fifth and sixth centuries. Over time the language diverged from Irish Gaelic and became the language of the majority of Scotland after it replaced Cumbric (a spoken variety of Old Welsh) and Pictish (now extinct). From around 850 to about 1150 C.E. Gaelic achieved political dominance becoming the language of the Crown and of Government (Oram, 2011). Over a similar period Old Norse was widely spoken in the Northern Isles (Orkney and Shetland) during the Viking occupation from the 8th to the 13th centuries and Norn (a descendent of Old Norse) was still spoken on Shetland in the later middle ages. The

Scandinavian influence on Scotland's linguistic landscape is illustrated by the numerous place names of Norwegian and Danish origin.

Other influences on Scotland's rich linguistic heritage include Latin during the medieval period via Roman soldiers and later Christianity, and French due to the Norman invaders and the Auld Alliance between the kingdoms of France and Scotland (1295–1560). Meanwhile, Scots, a Germanic language in origin, made inroads into southern Scotland from northern England in the early seventh century. Scots has a rich literary past and it assumed political authority in the sixteenth century when it was the prestigious language of education and commerce as it gradually replaced Latin as the language of official documentation. An illustration of Scotland's historical language diversity can be seen in the witnesses to charters where the several signatories were Welsh, Gaelic, Norse, Anglo-Saxon and French names (Murison, 1979). It was not until 1707, with the Acts of Union between the Scottish and English parliaments, that English became the language of education and power while both Scots and Gaelic became marginalized as the languages became restricted to lower status domestic environments.

Regional languages

For several centuries after the Acts of Union both Gaelic and Scots suffered from neglect, and indeed opposition, but since the 1980s and leading up to the establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999 there has been a resurgence of general interest in the interwoven relationship between language loyalty, nationalism and identity formation (Nicolson, 2003). As a consequence a number of policies have been introduced and initiatives implemented to revitalize both the Gaelic and the Scots language in schools in Scotland. Meanwhile these languages have also benefited from a series of texts and recommendations from the Council of Europe to target these regional and minority languages for promotion and action (Council of Europe, 2010), alongside other regional and minority languages such as Catalan and Basque in

Spain and Sámi in Finland (Juaristi, Reagan & Tonkin, 2008).

The evidence of the Gaelic revival is apparent in education, which has experienced a steady expansion in the number of children over the last thirty years being instructed in Gaelic both in primary schools and nurseries (Council of Europe, 2010; Robertson, 2003). This is in no doubt due to a combination of substantial investment in the provision of Gaelic-medium education (GME) and the strengthening of the legal status of the language through the *Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005* which declares Gaelic to be an ‘official language of Scotland’.³

Surveys have repeatedly revealed that the vast proportion of parents cite the social and academic advantages of bilingualism as one of the main reasons for choosing GME for their children (O’Hanlon, McLeod & Paterson, 2010). This parental belief is backed up by research into attainment which clearly demonstrates that children in GME (who are not exposed to English in the classroom until at seven years of age) tend to outperform their English medium counterparts in English literacy acquisition by the end of their primary schooling (O’Hanlon et al., 2010). These favorable results are consistent with previous research more than a decade ago (Johnstone, Harlen, MacNeil, Stradling & Thorpe, 1999) and it also echoes international studies conducted into other language immersion programs (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Unfortunately, this core argument about the personal and intellectual benefits of this type of provision is frequently lost within political and policy-making forums in Scotland and there are currently no serious plans to extend this type of bilingual education to other languages in Scotland. Instead, the debate in public arenas about GME tends to become emotionally charged and restricted to negative attitudes about the limited social and economic value of learning a minoritized language with negligible global standing.

Bòrd na Gàidhlig,⁴ with support from the Scottish Government, launched a second five-year National Plan for Gaelic in 2012 with an ambitious target to double the number of children starting school (age 4-5 years) in GME by 2017. However, policy planners need to take into account a number of factors if GME aims to sustain its educational achievements and

young people's longer-term proficiency in Gaelic-English bilingualism. First, there is no written national guidance for GME which defines effective pedagogical practice in delivering this type of bilingual provision. According to educational inspectors (HMIE, 2011) different interpretations of immersion and total immersion have emerged across Scotland resulting in a great variation in teaching methodologies and in children's learning experiences. One of the challenges for teachers working in GME is taking account of shifting Gaelic identities (Oliver, 2005) and the increasing numbers of pupils drawn from non-Gaelic speaking homes (especially in the urban conurbations) which requires a shared understanding of the principles of additional language acquisition, knowledge of research into bilingualism and pedagogical practices associated with different models of immersion education. Second, GME has not been extended to the same extent into the secondary sector because of an acute shortage of specialist teachers who can teach in Gaelic resulting in a lack of continuity and progression in bilingual and biliteracy development.

The expansion of GME since 1965 has been an important step forward for Gaelic regeneration and GME is currently available in about sixty primary schools throughout Scotland. However, the language stills remains in a relatively fragile state as the demographic profile indicates a declining rate of children and young people acquiring Gaelic in the home. According to the 2001 census just under two percent of the population had some Gaelic language ability and the 2010 pupil census (Scottish Government, 2011a) indicates only about 0.6% of children and young people enrolled in schools receive Gaelic-medium education.

This can be compared with Wales – another devolved state within the United Kingdom - where more robust LEP policies have allowed language revitalization to work more effectively. This has been attributed mainly to the expansion of Welsh-medium education alongside the introduction of Welsh as a compulsory subject in the National Curriculum for all pupils from five to sixteen years (Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004). In contrast to the Welsh case, in Scotland teaching Gaelic as a subject in mainstream schools, as an additional strand of

provision, has been sporadic and less systematic (Johnstone, 2003). According to Williams (2008), the mainstreaming of bilingual education in Wales, regardless of where children are on the linguistic continuum, sends an important message that the language belongs to all and not just a minority of speakers.

What is required in Scotland is for the political debate in policy making circles to be shifted from a rhetoric of linguistic survival and cultural enrichment to one where Gaelic education is discussed within a wider framework of strategic planning where a national language policy is committed to the active promotion of bilingualism and multilingualism in mainstream education regardless of the status that languages hold in society.

The *Education (Scotland) Act* of 1872 and the introduction of a broad universal system of education saw no specific recognition of languages other than English, and thereby Scots tended to be prohibited at school and viewed by many educationalists as a low status ‘corrupt version of English’. However, it is claimed that Scots is still spoken by around 30% of the population living mainly in the urban and rural lowlands of Scotland (Taylor Nelson Sofres, 2010), and the post-devolutionary period has seen positive moves towards promoting and validating the Scots language through educational initiatives. This has been helped by the recognition of Scots as a language in its own right by the European Union in 2001.

The most recent Scottish Government is demonstrating its commitment to raising the profile of Scots through a variety of measures, such as the publication of the audit of Scots language activity (Evans, 2009), the inclusion of a formal question on Scots language ability in the 2011 census for the first time, research into public attitudes towards the Scots language (Taylor Nelson Sofres, 2010), the financial support for two important Scots language bodies (Scottish Language Dictionaries and the Scots Language Centre) and the establishment of a Scots Language Working Group (Scottish Government, 2010).

Scots has a rich literary heritage, including the works of Scotland’s national poet Robert Burns, the celebration of whose life each January is a global event, who wrote primarily in

Scots. An audit of provision, one of the first pieces of policy research commissioned on the topic (Evans, 2009), revealed a growing number of imaginative school-based projects to raise the status of the language in conjunction with outreach programs from the Scots Language Centre (see <http://www.scotslanguage.com/>) and resources produced by the national agency for curriculum development (Education Scotland⁵) and Itchy Coe (the publisher of Scots language books for children). These initiatives give children opportunities to express themselves in their own language and provide educationalists with an increasing awareness of the social capital (Bourdieu, 1991) of Scots. Furthermore, research has demonstrated that Scots-speaking children, (in particular boys and disaffected pupils) show a marked improvement in both self-esteem and literacy following the incorporation of Scots into the primary school curriculum (Craig, 2009).

However, the audit (Evans, 2009) also revealed that in the absence of established policy structures instituted at national level, support for Scots in educational spaces tends to be on a local and piecemeal basis and excessively reliant on individuals, particularly committed teachers, who devote time to the study of the language and literature. In addition, there was evidence that much activity was in higher education and in the primary school sector, with little evidence of growth in the secondary school sector.

Despite being a language often heard in the home, Scots also suffers from its close linguistic relationship to English and with corresponding disagreements among sections of society (Taylor Nelson Sofres, 2009) as to whether Scots constitutes a distinct language, or whether it is just a fragmented range of distinct regional dialects which are spoken throughout the country. The standing of the language is also subject to polarized opinions among teachers, some of who perceive Scots as nothing more than slang or an inferior form of standard English, unsuitable for educational purposes, whereas advocates of Scots believe that the 'dialect or language' debate is superfluous and demeans those that use the language in their daily speech. Furthermore, it is suggested that this questioning of the linguistic terminology

for Scots detracts attention away from discussing the legitimacy and prestige of the language whose place in Scottish history has attracted much attention (Costa, 2010) alongside its long literary tradition (Kay, 2006).

Recently Scots has benefited from an increased degree of public recognition and respect, and the language is more widely appreciated as an intrinsic part of Scotland's history, culture and identity (Taylor Nelson Sofres, 2009). This has resulted in the establishment of a cross-party strategic task force by the Scottish Government in 2010 to investigate how the usage and status of the Scots language can be further strengthened. The Government's response to the Working Group recommendations (Scottish Government, 2011b) agreed to take the opportunity of the cycle of the Council of Europe Charter for Regional and Minority Languages to advance a policy on Scots. This gives a strong sense that policy development is afoot for the treatment of the Scots language but it is too early to determine what change agendas are in the pipeline.

Modern foreign languages (MFL)

As well as support for the protection of Regional languages the Council of Europe has also put considerable energy into supporting the elaboration of LEP in member states (Council of Europe, 2003, 2007) alongside assessment tools to promote and improve language learning for all citizens (Council of Europe, 2000, 2011). These policies and official documents in conjunction with an Action Plan on Education from the European Commission of the EU (European Commission, 2003) emphasize the need for individuals to develop plurilingual repertoires from a very early age with a focus on linguistic diversity, international employability, sensitivity to intercultural encounters and democratic citizenship (Baetens Beardsmore, 2009).

Scotland has a long tradition of teaching Modern Foreign Languages (MFL) but schools' progress in addressing the EU's plurilingual aspiration reveals limited progress in a number of

areas. MFL policy in education has been shaped by the recommendations of the Mulgrew Report, 'Citizens of a Multilingual World' (Scottish Executive, 2000a), which stated that every Scottish child was entitled to learn a MFL in the final two years of the primary school (ages 10-12 years). However, an audit of provision (SCILT, 2011a) reveals an uneven terrain of entitlement of MFL teaching across Scotland with some primary schools setting the pace with provision extended to four year-old children in early years settings while in some primaries no modern languages are taught at all due to a lack of adequately trained staff. This inevitably impacts on continuity and progression in language acquisition as children start their secondary education with very different levels of attainment in a MFL.

The patchy MFL provision in primary schools also needs to be viewed in the light of a significant and a worrying 15% decline over the past decade in the uptake in learning languages (with the exception of Spanish) and a subsequent drop in the number of pupils taking MFL forward to examination at secondary level (SQA, 2011). This lack of motivation to take up foreign languages and the climate of negativity especially in the post fourteen years stage in Scotland is blamed on a world becoming progressively more interconnected and modernized in which English is emerging as the *lingua franca* of international communication and popular culture. Consequently, there exists throughout Scottish society a belief about the doubtful merits of learning other languages in a world dominated by English and a widespread expectation that other people can and will communicate in English. Yet, research conducted in Scotland reveals this dependency on English as a global language is both a fallacy and short sighted and this prevailing monolingual mentality impedes Scottish students culturally, educationally and economically (Scottish Government, 2011b).

A further illustration of the inconsistency that exists between entitlement and provision is the limited scope of languages available for study in the secondary sector. This includes a tilting towards popular European languages and particularly a preference for French.

According to National Qualifications Catalogue (SQA, 2011), the number of foreign languages which can be taught and chosen as a subject for examination stands at twenty-five. This includes (amongst others) the popular European languages (French, Spanish and German); Scandinavian languages (Finnish and Swedish); classical languages (Greek and Latin), languages of migrants (Urdu, Mandarin/Cantonese, Polish) and British Sign Language (BSL). Although the choice appears wide a number of factors such as the availability of trained teachers and the squeezing out of language teaching within a crowded secondary curriculum has lead to a situation where in reality very few options are available to students and the vast majority of schools concentrate on three major European languages (cited above) which account for 97.3% of all language examinations at Standard Grade (the qualification set at the end of compulsory schooling when students are 16 years of age). Of interest the figures reveal that the fourth most popular language examined was Latin, with a learner uptake greater than Gaelic, Italian and Urdu (SQA, 2011).

While there are instances of innovative practice (SCILT, 2011b) inspection evidence indicates that practice in delivering modern languages varies in standard and quality in secondary schools (HMIE, 2007) and a predisposition for traditional approaches to foreign language teaching means young people are not always sufficiently challenged and motivated. These instructional approaches emphasize the rote learning of vocabulary and grammar and over-dependence on teaching to the test and teaching from textbooks. Presently, there is a divergence here with the preferred pedagogical method adopted in mainly the primary school sector where attempts are made to employ the extensive use of the target language through daily classroom routines, embedding languages in the curriculum and interdisciplinary learning (Hood & Tobutt, 2009).

Taking the Gaelic model to one side, the number of immersion programs in Scottish primary schools where children are involved in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) remains very thin on the ground. Exceptions include a French project (Johnstone &

McKinstry, 2008), and an Italian initiative (Crichton & Templeton, 2010). This lack of provision can be compared with other parts of Europe where the employment of CLIL as a pedagogical approach to language learning is a growing phenomenon (Ruiz de Zarobe & Jiménez Catalán, 2009; Cummins, 2011). It is unfortunate that Scotland has found no further appetite for such CLIL provision as a part of mainstream education despite research confirming the benefits for CLIL students in both motivation and language competency (Lasagabaster, 2011).

The portrait above reveals that Scotland is currently lagging behind its European neighbors in nurturing plurilingual citizenship where school children have more opportunities to study several foreign languages simultaneously and from a younger age (Eurydice, 2012). The Scottish Government's response has been to establish a Languages Working Group (LWG) which has provided strategic advice and a challenging 'roadmap' for teaching and learning languages in Scottish schools based on the 1+2 model recommended by the EU (Scottish Government, 2012a). This attempt to radically reform MFL policies includes earlier access to language learning for children at the primary stage, enhanced partnership between primary and secondary schools, more extensive and more effective use of technology and regular access to native and fluent speakers to stimulate young people's interest in language learning. However, at this point in time it is too early to comment on how the proposed program of work will be fully embedded into schools in order to bring benefits to all young people.

The heritage languages of migrants

In contrast to the Scottish Government's investment in rejuvenating regional languages and its commitment to the expansion of MFL teaching outlined in the previous sections, the heritage languages of migrants have received scant policy attention. This is to be regretted as the need for policy makers and teachers to take account of the diverse nature of schools continues to

grow as a range of factors have seen the scale and scope of migration transform the multilingual nature of classrooms in Scotland in recent years. In the main urban areas (Glasgow and Edinburgh) more than 12% of the school population speak languages other than English whereas the national figure is almost 4% speaking 167 different home languages (Scottish Government, 2011a).

The linguistic demography of Scotland has for nearly half a century been characterized by large settled communities of citizens originally from commonwealth countries such as Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Hong Kong. More recently, the enlargement of the European Union in 2004 and 2007 brought a substantial, and largely unexpected, arrival of migrant workers seeking employment, especially from Poland, who contribute to the country's economy and whose children have added to the richness of multilingual classrooms (Rolf & Metcalf, 2009).

Political and economic instability across the globe have seen the arrival of significant numbers of refugee and asylum-seeking families to Scotland (Candappa, Ahmad, Balata, Dekhine & Gocmen, 2007). Most of these asylum seeker families originate from a range of countries experiencing conflict (such as Afghanistan, Somalia and Sudan) or persecution (such as the Roma in eastern Europe and Kurds in Iraq). Further illustrations of sociolinguistic diversification include a vibrant and diverse Deaf community who are users of BSL (Wilson et al., 2012) and a traditional Traveller/Gypsy movement who speak a Gaelic-based language referred to as the Cant (Kirk & Ó Baoill, 2002).

The nature of these new patterns of migration to Scotland over the last decade are characterized by the notion of 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007). Such a phenomenon is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new and scattered, multiple-origin, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified migrants. This kind of complexity in the wake of global population flows poses on the one hand challenges for both language policy planners and provision in schools but on the other hand it

also provides fertile ground for schools with an unparalleled potential to tap into the linguistic resources of school students.

Not long after devolution, the new Scottish administration published its National Cultural Strategy (Scottish Executive, 2000b) with an aim to promote Scotland's languages as cultural expressions. It identifies English as 'both asset and threat' and includes among its key priorities the supportive assertions 'to ensure that through their initial training and continuing professional development (CPD), teachers are well prepared to promote and develop all pupils' language skills' and 'to consider how the languages of Scotland's ethnic minorities can be supported and how their contribution to Scotland's culture can be recognised and celebrated'. Within the Strategy is a discourse that makes an explicit connection between the active use of heritage languages and economic benefits to the country (Lo Bianco, 2008). However, despite these laudable statements and endorsement for the promotion of Scotland's multilingual resources the impact of the strategy on Scotland's heritage languages in terms of provision and practice and has been disappointingly inadequate to date.

With the exception of Urdu and Chinese there are almost no opportunities in mainstream schools to learn the heritage languages in use among Scottish school children and young people. McPake (2006) outlines a number of compelling reasons why the provision of heritage language learning should be considered within the same policy context as the other languages of Scotland including Gaelic, Scots and BSL. First, all minority speakers share similar concerns and dilemmas about maintaining their language and these families have a right to pass on their linguistic heritage to their children. Second, children who have the chance to grow up plurilingual have the obvious social, linguistic and cognitive advantages of being able to speak more than one language and these benefits can be translated into educational achievement. Finally, having access to a repertoire of languages is an intellectual resource for Scotland and enhances individuals' participation in the global knowledge economy.

In the absence of an inclusive language policy it is therefore left to the efforts and

resourcefulness of minority communities and concerned parents to establish and organize complementary schools⁶ in order to develop their children's heritage languages as they believe it is integral to their identity, home literacy practices and cultural heritage (Hancock, 2006). The expansion of these weekend and evening schools can be viewed in terms of Bourdieu's (1990) notion of agency and the capacity of parents to act independently and make their own choices as a direct result of institutional structures and a system of 'linguistic apartheid' (Wei, 2006) which limit children's opportunities to maintain their heritage languages.

McPake (2006), who has conducted the only audit of complementary schools in Scotland, has shown that the scope and nature of such provision are very patchy. While there are some excellent programs, and the level of commitment among providers is high, much of the provision is constrained by lack of resources as the schools rely on the campaigning strength of community members to self-fund, chase restricted grants from local councils or pursue subsidies from consulates. Furthermore, the complementary schoolteachers frequently include volunteer parents (predominantly mothers) and visiting international students who suffer from a lack of professional development opportunities (Hancock, 2012). As a result, this type of bottom-up provision continues to suffer from a lack of official recognition while mainstream schools consistently fail to acknowledge and draw on the minority child's linguistic and cultural capital for educational purposes (Hancock, 2010).

An alternative view is to move away from dichotomous positions about linguistic rights and dominance of English (Pennycook, 2006) and recognize that minority communities have a desire to maintain control and ownership of their community-initiated schools. Consequently, this type of grass roots provision has a role in providing 'safe spaces' (Creese et al., 2006) for children and young people's exploration of self and evolving learner identity formation (Francis et al., 2009), translanguaging (García, 2009) and the production and reproduction of biliteracy development (Hancock, 2012). There is a postmodern argument here that language and literacy practices associated with diasporic communities no longer represent backward-

looking traditions, but may be allied to global youth culture and urban sophistication in an increasingly interconnected world (Martin-Jones et al., 2012). What is required is a fusion of agency and structure and moves towards closer links to be established between mainstream and complementary schools. Some seminal work on developing operational partnerships between the two sectors has been developed in England (The National Centre for Languages, 2008; Kenner & Ruby, 2012) but this kind of school-community collaboration has still to make significant inroads in Scotland.

Within the current language policy context migrant children and young people are faced with two or more competing languages, one of which is the language of education and socio-economic advancement. There is a strong incentive, therefore, for those in the language minority to learn the language of power in order to participate fully in mainstream society. As such, attention and energy has been directed towards providing appropriate English language support for bilingual learners where the focus is on attaining English language skills as quickly as possible instead of offering opportunities for developing their heritage language skills as a legitimate activity in its own right.

Unlike previous legislation, the *Education (Additional Support for Learning) Act 2004* represented a milestone in conceptualizing those who require additional support with their learning ranging from children and young people with a specific learning difficulty to learners whose parents suffer from alcohol and drug abuse. This shift towards and a more inclusive ideology with an emphasis on a dynamic understanding of 'need' includes learners with English as an additional language (EAL). The accompanying *Code of Practice (Revised edition)* contains the following advice to teachers:

A need for additional support does not imply that a child or young person lacks abilities and skills. For example, bilingual children or young people, whose first language is not English, may already have a fully developed home language and a wide range of achievements, skills and abilities. Any lack of English should be

addressed within a learning and teaching programme which takes full account of the individual's abilities and learning needs. (Scottish Government, 2011c, p. 25)

This legislation has considerably raised the profile of EAL within the Scottish educational context and the above discourse clearly acknowledges that the 'funds of knowledge' (González et al., 2005) bilingual children bring to school can act as a foundation for teaching and learning. However, an Inspectorate report (HMIE, 2009) states that learners with EAL are not always encouraged to use their heritage language as a tool for learning, heritage language resources remain scarce and learning activities are not always academically challenging.

But more fundamentally the concern within current legislation is the reference to the pejorative term 'additional support for learning' which only reinforces the negative connotations of bilingualism frequently held amongst large sections of society (Smyth, 2003). This somewhat naïve practice of policy makers of bracketing all EAL learners within the terms of the Act has created confusion amongst the teaching profession about this inclusive paradigm, as well as contributing towards a one-dimensional understanding of contemporary minority experiences. That is, it fails to take into account the full nature of children's multiple and transformative identities and their complex lived experiences with different languages and literacies in different domains (Lytra & Martin, 2010).

What is required is a counter discourse and a shift away from the traditional deficit 'language as a problem' orientation (Ruiz, 1984) towards language planning where support is provided to capitalize on the linguistic resources migrant children and young people bring to school. According to Menken and Garcia, "most language policy research remains national in scope, focusing on top-down policies and analysing written policy statements overlooking the central role of classroom practitioners" (2010, p. 1). Similarly, Candelier (2008) conceptualizes LEP in terms of action which can be conscious and official or militant. That is, teachers can take action and intervene to help shape the nature of control of the place of languages in schools and send powerful messages about the acceptance or rejection of

bilingualism and biliteracy (Cummins, 2000) (for illustrations of educators negotiating language policies and implementing instructional practices that affirm student identities, see García et al., 2006; Cummins & Early, 2011; Helot & Ó Laoire, 2011).

Taxonomy of language planning

The preceding section has provided a brief sketch of the impact of LEP on Scotland's schools and has illustrated how a post-devolutionary political context has yielded separate policy consideration for Gaelic, Scots and MFL, compared both with each other and with the heritage languages of migrants. This has given rise to 'language silos' as policy formation and provision has been fashioned through a variety of mechanisms such as legislation, policy statements, and individual school or community initiatives but independent of a comprehensive and integrated national policy for languages.

What then are the challenges and tensions that currently persist around a more balanced and equitable approach to LEP development in Scotland? In an attempt to address this question Lo Bianco's (2007) taxonomy of language planning activities has been modified to guide the discussion and includes the following components: *jurisdiction* (legal authority and directives of the state) *sovereignty* (territories vested with local autonomy); *influence* (persuasion and promotion); *retention and recovery* (bottom-up planning processes from diasporic communities); and *acquisition* (top-down language planning involving foreign/additional language instruction). Although the five spheres are dealt with in turn it is important to stress the overlapping nature and interconnections across the taxonomy in order to fully understand the complex processes inherent in LEP development and action.

Jurisdiction

According to Lo Bianco (2007) the sphere of *jurisdiction* refers to overarching laws and directives of the state over its territories but for the purpose of this article this original definition

is adjusted as jurisdiction is not just exclusive to single states but operations can also be shared and pooled as is the case of the administration of the European Union (EU). This sphere of jurisdiction is applicable to Scotland as it is still politically tied to the United Kingdom (UK) while the UK is locked into a formal and interwoven relationship with the EU. This inevitably leads to supra-national LEP complexities and ambiguities (Spolsky, 2004). As such, the UK government's ambivalent attitude to EU policy has been exposed through its initial reluctance to ratify the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (1992), waiting over eight years after the original signatures. According to Judge (2008) this indifference constitutes a powerful form of rejection and adds to a significant delay towards taking forward any action to protect Scotland's regional languages.

Similarly, jurisdictional complications are inevitable when individual member states not only deliberate on their own response to EU policy but also act independently and put their own interpretation on non-binding directives (Smith, 2003; Spolsky, 2004). For example, Little (2010) outlines a number of recommendations and resolutions from the Council of Europe relating to children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds and the place of 'mother tongue'⁷ in school education. For example, Article 19 of the European Social Charter (revised, 1996) which refers to signatories' undertaking 'to promote and facilitate, as far as practicable, the teaching of the migrant worker's mother tongue to the children of the migrant worker' and recommendation 1740 (2006) of the Parliamentary Assemblée 'it is desirable to encourage, as far as possible, young Europeans to learn their mother tongue (or main language) when this is not an official language of their country'.

Despite many years of the UK Government rhetoric on celebrating diversity it has hidden behind its discretionary powers and steadfastly refused to promote or facilitate 'mother tongue' teaching in mainstream schools by using the opt-out clauses in the European charter by claiming that provision was not 'practicable' or 'appropriate' or that numbers were not 'sufficient' (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006, p. 276). Whereas, a number of European states (Finland,

Sweden and the Netherlands, for instance) have interpreted notions of language entitlement in terms of social justice and have applied the fundamental principle of the right to education through more than one language, including their first language if they wish within designated schools (McPake & Tinsley, 2007).

Sovereignty

The sphere of *sovereignty* refers to territories vested with local autonomy and Scotland is a clear case of this system of governance. That is, the UK Parliament retains political authority on a range of reserved matters such as immigration and nationality, but historically Scotland has retained devolved powers to decide on education and legal matters. One of the first Inquiries of the Education, Culture and Sport Committee, following the establishment of the newly devolved government, was to investigate the role of educational and cultural policy in supporting and developing Gaelic, Scots and minority languages in Scotland. The subsequent report in 2003 made a commitment to introduce a national language strategy to guide the promotion of Scotland's languages. After a further four years of deliberation a draft language strategy was compiled and distributed for consultation in 2007. Responses were received but it was far from universally accepted because of the preferential treatment afforded to different languages.

However, the election of a nationalist-led parliament in 2007 and 2011 has led to two important consequences for LEP development. First, the heralding of new political regime meant the consultation process on a national language strategy, initiated by the previous administration, was shelved. Second, a new political orientation has heralded an independence agenda and a pursuit for greater sovereignty. This move towards constitutional change has witnessed a resurgence of interest in both Gaelic, and particularly the Scots language, with their strong symbolic claim on Scotland's cultural heritage and emotional ties to a sovereign Scottish identity.

At the same time tensions exist between the two languages and lobbyists have at times

focused their energies on combating the rival claims of the other as the rightful 'indigenous' language of the state and rather than protecting the languages against the hegemony of English (Joseph, 2004). This uneasy relationship is not helped by the Gaelic language being considered by a vocal sector of Scottish opinion to be merely regional, and restricted to a small number of speakers, rather than of genuine national importance (Walsh & McLeod, 2008). Whereas, Scots is still stigmatized as a patchwork of 'non-standard' varieties of English, viewed by many as inferior speech and unfit for inclusion in schools (Evans, 2009). That said, the possibility of independence resulting from the referendum in 2014 might give a new meaning of sovereignty and the treatment of the regional languages in this sphere of language planning.

Influence

This sphere of *influence* involves an array of activities involving persuasion and promotion. In the Scottish context, this definition encompasses Gaelic and Scots, both of which to varying degrees have gained from Scottish Government support and investment. However, the promotion of heritage languages is frequently at the discretion of shifting ideologies mediated through geopolitical and economic considerations rather than a concern for social justice or the educational enrichment to citizens gained from individual bilingual development (Bialystok, 2004).

This can be illustrated by China's re-emerging position of strength within global economics and trading systems which has produced demands, within both business and political circles, for Chinese to be taught in Scottish schools to support Scotland's commercial activity with China. This is not unlike the promotion of Japanese teaching in the 1990s. A new era of educational cooperation between China and Scotland (Scottish Government, 2008, 2012b) has seen Chinese government investment in the creation of Confucius hubs in Scottish schools to support the teaching of Mandarin Chinese. This promotion follows similar patterns

in the expansion of teaching Chinese in mainstream schools observed internationally (Liu & Lo Bianco, 2007; Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010).

Unfortunately, minimal thought has been paid to the complex issue of language planning associated with Chinese with its differentiated scripts (traditional and simplified), alphabetic transcriptions to support reading and wide range of spoken varieties of Chinese (Cheung & Ng, 2003). So far the teaching of Chinese has been aimed at the more privileged groups in society with an approach to teaching which is open to criticism as it concentrates on superficial oral acquisition and tokenistic cultural awareness activities rather than acquiring literacy for academic purposes. Furthermore, no attention has been devoted to the needs of the large settled Chinese diaspora in Scotland who have their origins in Hong Kong and mainly speak Cantonese and Hakka and their well-established complementary school provision. The very small uptake of the Chinese secondary school qualification in Cantonese (SQA, 2011) is a reflection of this language policy neglect.

Retention and recovery

Applied to Scotland this category of bottom-up processes to support language retention and recovery can be evidenced by the current educational interest in promoting Scots in schools by committed teachers and the preservation of Gaelic as a result of parental requests for bilingual provision. But this language revitalization is in stark contrast to the policy vacuum associated with the intergenerational maintenance of the languages of migrants and the increasing numbers of learners in Scottish schools with prior experiences of languages other than English.

As noted in the previous section linguistic minority groups typically show a rapid shift to the dominant language, motivated by a desire to learn a high-prestige language which they hope will equip them with educational qualifications and socio-economic mobility. In this situation, they risk losing their home language, which is often perceived by wider society as a low status language. The norm is a three-or four-generation shift (Garcia, 2009) but the degree of variation

and degree of maintenance of the heritage language varies as a result of children learning their heritage language through complementary schooling and home practices (Hancock, 2006).

While the thrust of the recommendations outlined by the Languages Working Group, established by the Scottish Government in 2011, are one of learning modern European languages, the report attempts to be inclusive by stating, “consideration should be given to... teaching languages of the strong economies of the future, Gaelic and community languages of pupils in schools” (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 14). The challenge now is for schools to think creatively and provide scope for including minority languages (including BSL) in the menu of possibilities for incipient plurilingualism for all learners. This requires a move away from an ideological position which perceives the learning of heritage languages as ‘sentimental’ rather than a skill (May, 2006) and much work needs to be done in convincing educationalists of the value of building on migrant children’s existing linguistic resources, in terms of citizenship, employability and the potential cognitive benefits of bilingualism regardless of the status the languages hold in society.

Acquisition

This sphere of influence is the top down counterpart of the retention and recovery and encompasses a range of factors involving foreign and additional language instruction. The new policy steer based on the European Union 1+2 model promises to introduce language learning from the start of primary school and to create the conditions in primary schools in which every child will acquire two languages in addition to their own mother tongue by 2020 (Scottish Government, 2012a). At the time of writing the Government has announced funding for pilot projects in nine schools which will trial and demonstrate ways in which schools can make the transition to the 1+2 model.

Achieving the Government’s manifesto promise will require a substantial commitment to resources at a time of unprecedented financial constraint and a radical overhaul of current

provision to allow an entitlement to learning two additional languages. Responsibility has been placed on the thirty-two local education authorities in Scotland to consider what language to offer and what support is required for schools (including access to native speakers). Even with the budget and political will to implement this ambitious program its success relies on a cultural shift in language learning so children and young people recognize that knowing only one language -- English -- is insufficient to engage fully in a global society and economy.

This sphere of LEP activity is also bound up with the acquisition of English and the development of contemporary political debates about social integration and the construction of homogeneous nation-states. This discourse perceives the knowledge of, and learning of heritage languages as a risk to the community cohesion agenda and a threat to a 'shared' cultural identity. The result is the UK Government's imposition of compulsory English language and citizenship testing since 2005 for those applying for naturalization. This idea that settlement requirements are made conditional on the proficiency of the 'official' English language communicates 'false' messages to teachers working in multilingual schools. In other words, this covert policy of using language to legitimize or delegitimize people only reinforces an ideology of linguistic homogeneity rather than embracing linguistic pluralism as a resource for the nation-state (Blackledge, 2009).

The manipulation of language and citizenship testing regimes is not just restricted to the UK but is visible across Europe (Extra et al., 2009). That said, the political discourse which disparages migrant groups as different and dangerous is less pronounced in Scotland compared to England (Sturman, Rowe, Sainsbury, Wheater & Kerr, 2012) and the current debate over reclaiming a new 'sovereign' identity in Scotland adds a further ingredient to the conceptualization of language as a marker of identity and the multifaceted understandings of being 'British', 'English' or 'Scottish'.

Conclusion

This article has illustrated the kinds of imbalances and omissions that exist in the development of LEP associated with the different languages in Scotland when coherent and synchronized national language policy and planning is absent. Consequently, the school system is characterized by *ad hoc* language policies marked by differentiated entitlements and provision and a significant linguistic policy gulf, between English as the official language of instruction in schools and all the other languages used by people in Scotland. In some areas, such as GME, encouraging changes have occurred in bilingual provision, a new policy direction for MFL has been set out but progress remains slow and the languages of migrants continue to be largely ignored at school level.

LEP is not only concerned with languages per se but it is also about an expression of shared values and principles and a set of choices that society makes. As such it is an intrinsically political matter and the challenge for the Scottish Government is to take decisive action and dispense with the language segregationist approach that has framed and shaped LEP to date. In its place, policy makers and civic society need to recast language planning in more strategic and inclusive ways and begin to articulate a commitment to promoting linguistic pluralism and social justice which views multilingualism as an asset for individual citizens and for nation-building in this increasingly complex and globalized world.

Notes [The end notes did not seem to transfer properly; please check these carefully.]

1. For the purpose of this article and consistency heritage language refers to languages other than English spoken by migrant communities recently settled in Scotland and not Gaelic or Scots which are categorized as regional languages associated with long-established communities within the context of the European Union (EU). It is acknowledged that the definition of both heritage languages and regional languages are contentious.

2. Previous to the creation of the Scottish Parliament in 1999 educational policy and practice in Scotland (along with the church and law) had remained distinctive from the ways of England and the other two nations - Wales and Northern Ireland - that make up the rest of the United Kingdom (UK).
3. However the Act did not grant parents any rights in relation to Gaelic education. An amendment to this effect was defeated and this omission is considered one of the principal shortcomings of the Act.
4. Bòrd na Gàidhlig is an executive non-departmental public body of the Scottish Government with responsibility for Gaelic.
5. For details of resources see www.educationscotland.gov.uk/knowledgeoflanguage/scots/index.asp
6. The term 'complementary' school has replaced 'community' and 'supplementary' school in the UK in order to illustrate the positive complementary function of teaching and learning between these weekend and evening schools and mainstream schools.
7. The use of 'mother tongue' in EU documentation is regarded as gender-specific in the UK and has been rejected in favor of 'first language'.

References

- Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2009). Language promotion by European supra-national institutions. In O. García (Ed.), *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective* (pp. 197-217). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blackledge, A. (2009). As a country we do expect: The further extension of language testing regimes in the UK. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 6, 6-16.
- Bialystok, E. (2004). Language and literacy development. In T. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 557-601). Malden, M.A: Blackwell.

- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Candelier, M. (2008). 'Awakening to languages' and educational language policy. In J. Cenoz & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 6: Knowledge about language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 219-232). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Candappa, M., Ahmad, M., Balata, B., Dekhine, R. & Gocmen, D. (2007). *Education and schooling for asylum seeking and refugee students in Scotland: An exploratory study*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Cheung, H., & Ng, L. H. (2003). Chinese reading development in some major Chinese societies: An introduction. In C. McBride-Chang & Hsuan-Chih Chen (Eds.), *Reading development in Chinese children* (pp. 3-19). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Costa, J. (2010). Language history as charter myth? Scots and the (re)invention of Scotland. *Scottish Language*, 28, 1-25.
- Council of Europe. (2000). *European language portfolio*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2003). *Guide for the development of languages education policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2007). *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2010). *ECRML: Application of the Charter in the United Kingdom*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Crichton, H., & Templeton, B. (2010). *An evaluation of the partial immersion project at St. Aloysius College Junior School*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the cross-fire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Cummins, J. (2011). *Putting the evidence back into evidence-based policies for underachieving students*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Cummins, J. & Early, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N. & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural heritage and learner identities in complementary schools.” *Language and Education*, 20(1), 23–43.
- Craig, C. (2009). *A comparative analysis of the use of Scots language and literature in selected primary and secondary schools in Aberdeenshire (2008/2009)*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University.
- European Commission. (2003). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004*. Brussels: European Unit.
- Eurydice. (2012). *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe 2012*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Evans, R. (2009). *Audit of current Scots language provision in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Extra, G., Spotti, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Language testing, migration and citizenship: International perspectives on testing regimes*. London: Continuum.
- Fishman, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Handbook of language and ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fortune, T., & Tedick, D. (Eds.). 2008. *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Francis, B., Archer, L. & Mau, A. (2009). Language as capital, or language as identity? Chinese complementary school pupils’ perspectives on the purposes and benefits of complementary schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 519–38.
- García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Torres-Guzman, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and globalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hancock, A. (2006). Attitudes and approaches to literacy in Scottish Chinese families. *Language and Education*, 20 (5), 355-373.
- Hancock, A. (2010). *Chinese children's experiences of biliteracy learning in Scotland*. (Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, Scotland).
- Hancock, A. (2012). Unpacking mundane practices: Children's experiences of learning literacy at a Chinese Complementary School in Scotland. *Language and Education*, 26 (1), 1-17.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education [HMIE]. (2007). *Modern languages: A portrait of current practice in Scottish schools*. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education [HMIE]. (2009). *Count us in: Meeting the needs of children and young people newly arrived in Scotland*. Livingston: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education [HMIE]. (2011). *Gaelic education: Building on the successes, addressing the barriers*. Livingston: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education.
- Helot, C., & Ó Laoire, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Language policy for the multilingual classroom: Pedagogy of the possible*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hood, P., & Tobutt, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Modern languages in the primary school*. London: Sage.
- Jones, D., & Vaughan & Martin-Jones, M. (2004). Bilingual education and language revitalization in Wales: past achievements and current issues. In J. Tollefson & A. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies. Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 43-70). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Johnstone, R. (2003). *Gaelic learners in the primary school*. Stirling: Scottish C.I.L.T.
- Johnstone, R., Harlen, W., MacNeil, M., Stradling, B. & Thorpe, G. (1999). *The attainment of*

- pupils receiving Gaelic-medium primary education in Scotland*. Stirling: Scottish C.I.L.T.
- Johnstone, R., & McKinstry, R. (2008). *Evaluation of early primary partial immersion in French*. Stirling: Scottish CILT.
- Joseph, J. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Judge, A. (2008). *Different approaches towards regional languages in France and the UK*. Paper presented at Seminar Series Research on Language Policy and Language Planning, 12.2.08, University of Edinburgh www.arts.ed.ac.uk/celtic/poileasaidh/ Accessed 13 July 2012.
- Juaristi, P., Reagan, T. & Tonkin, H. (2008). Linguistic diversity in the European Union: An overview. In X. Arzoz (Ed.), *Respecting linguistic diversity in the European Union* (pp. 47–72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kay, B. (2006). *The mither tongue* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh and London: Mainstream Publishing.
- Kenner, C. & Ruby, M. (2012). *Interconnecting worlds: Teacher partnerships for bilingual learning*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Kirk, J. & Ó Baoill, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Travellers and their language*. Belfast: Queens University Belfast.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18.
- Little, D. (2010). *The linguistic and educational integration of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds*. Language Policy Division, Council of Europe.
- Liu, G-Q & Lo Bianco, J. (2007). Teaching Chinese, teaching in Chinese, and teaching the Chinese. *Language Policy*, 6, 95-117.
- Lytra, V. & Martin, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Sites of multilingualism: Complementary schools in Britain today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2007). Emergent China and Chinese: Language planning categories. *Language Policy*, 6, 3-26.

- Lo Bianco, J. (2008). Policy activity for heritage languages. Connections with representation and citizenship. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Baucus (Eds.), *Heritage language education. A new field emerging* (pp. 53-69). London: Routledge.
- Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2012). Introduction: a sociolinguistics of multilingualism for our times. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 1-26). Oxen: Routledge.
- May, S. (2006). Language policy and minority rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 255-272). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Menken, K. & García, O. (2010). Introduction. In K. Menkin & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 1-10). London: Routledge.
- McPake, J. (2006). *Provision for community language learning in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.
- McPake, J. & Tinsley, T. (2007). *Valuing all language in Europe. ECML Research and Development Reports Series*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.
- Munn, P., Stead, J., McLeod, G., Brown, J., Cowie, M., McCluskey, M., Gillean, M., Pirrie, A. & Scott, J. (2004). Schools for the 21st century: The national debate on education in Scotland. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(4), 433–452.
- Murdoch, S. (1996). *Language politics in Scotland* (2nd ed.). Aberdeen: Aiberdeen Universitie Scots Leid Quorum.
- Murison, D. (1979). The historical background. In A. Aitken & T. McArthur (Eds.), *Languages of Scotland* (pp. 2-13). Edinburgh: Chambers.
- Nicolson, M. (2003). Language and who we are: Some Scottish student perspectives. *Scottish Educational Review*, 35(2), 121-134.
- O'Hanlon, F., McLeod, W. & Paterson, L. (2010). *Gaelic-medium education in Scotland: Choice and attainment in primary and early secondary school*. Edinburgh: Bòrd na Gàidhlig/University of Edinburgh.

- Olivier, J. (2005). Scottish Gaelic identities: Contexts and contingencies. *Scottish Affairs*, 51, 1-24.
- Oram, R. (2011). *Domination and Lordship: Scotland, 1070-1230*. New Edinburgh History of Scotland, Volume 3. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60-76). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rhodes, N. & Pufahl, I. (2010). *Foreign language teaching in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Robertson, B. (2003). Gaelic education. In T. Bryce & W. Humes (Eds.), *Scottish education post-devolution* (2nd ed.) (pp. 250-261). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rolf, H. & Metcalf, H. (2009). *Recent migration into Scotland: The evidence base*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., Catalan, J. & Rosa, M. (Eds.). (2009) *Content language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- SCILT. (2011a). *National survey of modern language provision in Scottish schools*. Glasgow: Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching (SCILT)
- SCILT. (2011b). *Modern languages excellence report*. Glasgow: Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching (SCILT).
- Scottish Qualifications Authority [SQA]. (2011). *Scottish Qualification Authority: Annual statistical report*, <http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/47250.html>. Accessed 4 July 2012.
- Scottish Executive. (2000a). *Citizens of a multilingual world, ministerial action group on languages* (Mulgrew Report). Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive. (2000b). *Creating our future...Minding our past, Scotland's national cultural strategy*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government. (2008). *Scotland's strategy for stronger engagement with China*.

- Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2010). *Report of the Ministerial Working Group on the Scots language*.
Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2011a). *Pupils in Scotland, 2010*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/SchoolEducation/pupilsupdata>
Accessed 26 November 2012
- Scottish Government. (2011b). *Scots Language Working Group Report: Response from the Scottish government*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/03/18094509/3>
- Scottish Government. (2011c). *Supporting children's learning: Code of practice* (rev. ed.).
Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government. (2012a). *Language learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach, Scottish Government languages working group report and recommendations*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2012b). *Scottish government China strategy 2012*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). Linguistic human rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 273-291). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, R. (2003). Mother tongue education and the law: A legal review of bilingualism with reference to Scottish Gaelic. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6(2), 129-145.
- Smyth, G. (2003). *Helping bilingual pupils to access the curriculum*. London: David Fulton.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sturman, L., Rowe, N., Sainsbury, M., Wheeler, R. & Kerr, D. (2012). *Citizens in transition in England, Wales and Scotland: Young citizens at 18-25*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research [NFER]
- Taylor Nelson Sofres (2009). *Public attitudes towards the Scots language*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government/ Taylor Nelson Sofres- British Market Research Bureau [TNS-BMRB].
- The National Centre for Languages [CILT]. (2008). *A toolkit for partnership: Our languages project*. Reading: National Centre for Languages.
- Thürmann, E., Vollmer, H. & Pieper, I. (2010). *Language(s) of schooling: Focusing on vulnerable learners*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.
- Walsh, J. & McLeod, W. (2008). An overcoat wrapped around an invisible man? Language legislation and language revitalization in Ireland and Scotland. *Language Policy*, 7, 21-46.
- Wei, Li. (2006). Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 76–83.
- Wilson, C., Turner, G. & Perez, I. (2012). Multilingualism and public service access: Interpreting in spoken and signed languages. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 314-332). Oxen: Routledge.

Please provide a translation of the English abstract (already at the start of the article) in any language you wish. I have provided the Esperanto translation below.

Résumé

Politique Linguistique Éducative dans une Écosse multilingue Opportunités, déséquilibres et débats.

Bien qu'étant un petit pays, l'Écosse jouit d'une composition linguistique riche et complexe.

Le but de cet article est d'analyser, en s'appuyant sur des documents et des discours officiels

ainsi que sur des pédagogies scolaires, l'image actuelle du rôle de la Politique Linguistique Éducative (PLE) dans le soutien et le développement des différentes langues d'Écosse. L'article commence par un historique de l'Écosse multilingue afin de contextualiser la PLE et de dissiper le mythe d'un pays monolingue. Cela sera suivi d'un examen des trois points de vue linguistiques principaux qui influent actuellement sur la PLE: les langues régionales, les langues vivantes étrangères et les langues de la migration. Il sera démontré qu'un monde post-décentralisation a fourni des opportunités d'élaboration et de discussion d'une PLE qui reflète une société multilingue, mais des déséquilibres significatifs et des problèmes d'équité subsistent entre les différentes catégories de langues en termes d'idéologie, de mesures et de pratiques. Enfin, la taxonomie de l'aménagement et de l'action linguistiques de Lo Bianco (2007) est modifiée afin d'avoir un aperçu des tensions et des défis qui existent autour d'une démarche cohésive pour le développement d'une PLE en Écosse.

Resumo

Lingvoeduka politiko en multlingva Skotlando: Eblecoj, malekvilibroj kaj debatoj

Skotlando malgrandas sed posedas riĉan kaj komplikan lingvan konsiston. La celo de tiu ĉi artikolo estas analizi la aktualan bildon de la rolo de lingvoeduka politiko (LEP) en subtenado kaj evoluigo de la diversaj lingvoj de Skotlando, ĉerpante el politikodokumentoj, politikodiskursoj kaj lernejoj pedagogioj. La artikolo komenciĝas per historia priskribo de multlingva Skotlando por kuntekstigi LEP kaj forigi la miton de unulingva lando. Sekvas ekzamenado de la tri ĉefaj lingvaj perspektivoj nuntempe influaj ĉe LEP: regionaj lingvoj, modernaj fremdlingvoj kaj la lingvoj de komunumoj de migrantoj. Oni ilustre montros, ke la postregioniga areno liveris okazojn por formuli kaj pridebati LEP, kiuj respegulas multlingvan socion, kvankam signifaj malekvilibroj kaj demandoj pri egaleco ankoraŭ restas inter la diversaj lingvokategorioj rilate al ideologio, mastrumo kaj praktiko. Fine, oni modifas la

taksonomion de Lo Bianco (2007) de lingvoplanado kaj lingvoagado por trafi konstatojn pri la streĉoj kaj defioj kiuj ĉirkaŭas koheran aliron al evoluigo de LEP en Skotlando.

Author's Address

Your Current Address and email.

Institute of Education, Teaching and Leadership
University of Edinburgh
Charteris Land
Holyrood Road, Edinburgh
EH8 8AQ

andy.hancock@ed.ac.uk

About the Author

Andy Hancock is Co-Deputy Head of Institute of Education, Teaching and Leadership at the University of Edinburgh. He is Co-Director of the Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland (CERES). His research interests include literacy practices in Chinese communities and student teachers' perceptions of multilingual primary classrooms.